

## **Local Plan Examination**

### **Examination Hearing Session 4**

**28<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

#### **Participants:**

Richmond upon Thames Borough Council  
026- Indigo Planning On Behalf Of Beechcroft Developments Ltd.  
059- Louise Spalding GVA Defence Infrastructure Organisation (SA14)  
169- Greater London Authority On Behalf Of Mayor of London (SA8) – see SOCG  
247- Lichfields On Behalf Of The Rugby Football Union (RFU)(SA11)  
275- Strawberry Hill Residents' Association  
304- Lichfields On Behalf Of West London Mental Health NHS Trust

#### **Agenda**

- a) Welcome**
- b) Factual updates and clarifications**
- c) Focus for Discussion:**

#### **Site Allocations**

1.	Are the Site Allocations justified by the evidence base and of sufficient detail so as to be effective in delivery?  Are heritage assets referenced adequately?
2.	SA2- does the allocation recognise adequately the heritage assets potentially affected?  How does the allocation reconcile flood risk?
3.	Is SA3 – justified by the evidence base and should it recognise the planning permission resolved to be granted by the Council?
4.	Are the provisions of SA7 sufficiently clear and justified? Should the allocation include specific reference to the provision of appropriate outside space and parking provision?
5.	SA8 – is the site allocation, particularly in relation to the extent of MoL, justified and consistent with the London Plan?

	Are heritage assets referenced appropriately?
6.	SA11 – is the allocation justified adequately and should it reference clearly the approach to growth of facilities at the site?
7.	SA14 – is the allocation justified and up to date? Is it sufficiently flexible to be effective in delivery?
8.	SA 15 – is the allocation justified by the evidence base with due regard to reasonable alternatives? Should the allocation be more flexibly worded to accommodate the potential for residential provision?
9.	SA 17 <sup>1</sup> – is the allocation justified by the evidence base, particularly in relation to the identified land uses and the garden designation as OOLTI (Other Open Land of Townscape Importance) and OSNI (Other Site of Nature Importance)? Will the allocation be capable of effective implementation?
10.	SA 16 <sup>2</sup> – is the allocation justified by the evidence base and will it be effective in delivery?

**d) AOB**

**e) Close**

---

<sup>1</sup> This question originally referred to SA16 in error. A discussion upon SA16 may be held at the Inspector's discretion following submission of additional statements.

<sup>2</sup> Additional question added for discussion in light of submissions at the Inspector's discretion (18.9.17).